

1959

ist leaders are too crafty and shrewd for us at the conference table. Their education system is superior to ours."

"We have been on the defense long enough. It is time for us to take the offensive and help make the whole world realize that the Communist idea is not a superidea—that the Communist leaders are not supermen—and that the Soviet Union is not a supernation. "We should not underestimate the deadly seriousness of the challenge which is presented to us because of the disciplined dedication of the Communist leaders. But let us not make the mistake of meeting that challenge with a negative, defeatist, static posture. * * *

"When Mr. Khrushchev challenges us to peaceful competition, let us go him one better and urge expansion of that competition to include the spiritual as well as the material aspects of our society. Let there be competition between ideas not only in the free world but in the Communist world as well. * * *

"When Mr. Khrushchev says that our grandchildren will live under communism, our answer should be: 'We do not fear the outcome, provided they have the freedom to choose the system they want.' We do not say in reply that his grandchildren will live under capitalism. The very essence of our belief is that we will not impose it on anyone else—and that every people should have the right to choose the kind of economic and political system which best fits its particular problems.

"But this we do believe: that all the people on this earth, including those of the Soviet Union, will inevitably demand and obtain more and more freedom. Because history teaches us that man was made to be free and that freedom—not communism or any other form of dictatorship—is the wave of the future. * * *

"Let our answer to the aggressive tactics of world communism not be simply defensive, negative, and fearful. The best answer to the Communist revolution is the kind of life produced by the American Revolution.

"The most effective antidote to communism is a program of intelligent, articulate, positive Americanism."

Now genius is often let loose in the land under the guise of unpretentious simplicity and a lot of us get fooled that way.

Those who will take the time to analyze very carefully what Dick Nixon has just said in the few telling paragraphs I have excerpted as the ideological meat of his address to the VFW will scarcely need to look further for an example of what I mean.

Actually, this constantly improving young man has laid his strategic groundwork in a sound and even brilliant way for what could indeed become "the wave for the future." Let's hope so.

Here he is preaching positive Americanism of the most constructive variety as the antidote to compulsory Communist one-worldism. He tells us to get off our dimes and toss apathy into the ashcan. In effect, he is saying: "Let's fight."

Well, isn't it about time for us to heed such words as these?

Trust and Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, paying tribute to the career of Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, who will retire on December 31, 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before this Congress reassembles in January, the active military career of a distinguished American marine will have come to a close.

Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, will retire on December 31. It is, I believe, only fitting that the Senate pause for a moment in these crowded, final days of this session to pay tribute to this dedicated, devoted and highly competent Marine.

I shall not comment upon his total career. His selection to command the Nation's elite force in readiness is in itself eloquent testimony in the caliber of his earlier service.

Instead, I believe we should give recognition to the innate dignity and professional competence which has characterized General Pate's performance of duty in the four difficult and trying years of our national history during which he has led our incomparable Marines.

They have not been easy years for the Nation. Certainly they have not been easy or quiet ones for our Marine Corps or its Commandant.

General Pate has led a corps which throughout his stewardship has been forced to accept and be prepared for heavier and heavier burdens even as its resources were steadily reduced.

It is in coping with the many problems which have inevitably resulted from meeting increased responsibilities with ever lessening means at hand that General Pate's steadiness and strength of character have proved of such value to the Nation and to his corps.

The corps has responded promptly, effectively and efficiently to every emergency it has been called upon to meet. I am convinced that its very readiness, so constantly stressed by General Pate, has on more than one occasion during his tenure been the decisive factor in crucial moments of international difficulty.

Trust and confidence are the key words in the commission of any officer of our Armed Forces. No words more correctly describe the relationship which has existed between General Pate and the Congress. We learned early, both individually and collectively, that in our dealings with General Pate we could trust his honest, clear, straightforwardness and repose complete confidence in his sound, professional judgment.

Pretense is foreign to his makeup. In any matter concerning the Marine Corps, large or small, we have always been able to feel that from General Pate we could expect a factual report, open discussion, a spirit of helpfulness, the traditional Marine Corps insistence upon serving well and with honor.

This esteem in which he is held is partly reflected in the repeated efforts of the Congress to insure to the Nation a Marine Corps of adequate strength in these perilous times—in our insistence that the status of this always combat-ready expeditionary force continue to be that of a separate service—that funds for its operations not be merged with those of another service, and most certainly in the strong congressional conviction that the Nation's security continues to rest upon the bedrock of properly balanced forces.

General Pate will leave a Marine Corps combat-ready, alert, constantly prepared to the limit of its resources to meet any demand the Nation may place upon it. He may properly take pride in the professional, soldierly, disciplined forces he has commanded so well.

In turn, we and the American people whom we represent, may take a quiet pride in the honored career of this distinguished Marine officer who is about to leave the active service of his corps and country.

I am certain that he will carry with him into retirement the best wishes of all of us who have learned to admire and respect him as one of the very best and very finest of our great American military leaders.

Author of Captive Nations Week Resolution a Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about the impact made by the Captive Nations Week resolution upon recent international developments. The explosion that this resolution caused in Moscow is sufficient evidence of this. The attack against the resolution in Mr. Khrushchev's article in the advance October issue of Foreign Affairs gives further evidence of the deep penetration it has made under the skin of Communist imperialism and tyranny.

I am proud to say that the author of this resolution, which rings with the principles and ideals of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, is a constituent in my district in Virginia. He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University. Dr. Dobriansky is also member of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, the widely known committee of "44" which has been at work on long-run principles and programs for the Republican Party. As vice chairman of its task force on national security and peace, Dr. Dobriansky has made several contributions to a forthcoming report in this field.

In his academic right, the professor is internationally known for his recent work on "Veblenism: A New Critique." He writes and lectures extensively on the subjects of communism, the Soviet Union, and the non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. In 1957-58 he was a member of the faculty at our National War College.

Relevant to his authorship of the Captive Nations resolution, I include in the RECORD the Chicago Daily Tribune interview of July 25, 1959, the August 6 article by David Lawrence on "U.S. People and Khrushchev," which appeared in the Evening Star, and Dr. Dobriansky's letter to the editor on "Irritating the Bear," that appeared in the July 29 issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, July 25, 1959]

CREDIT PROF WITH CAPTIVE NATIONS IDEA—LAYS KHRUSHCHEV FEEVE TO INCLUSION OF U.S.S.R.

WASHINGTON, July 24.—A professor of Russian economics at Georgetown University here was disclosed Friday as the man who conceived the Captive Nations Week idea that aroused the ire of Russian Nikita Khrushchev.

September 14

He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, 41, who was born in New York City of parents of Ukrainian descent. Dobriansky first started work on the project more than a year ago.

The office of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, who guided the resolution in connection with the observance through Congress, confirmed the educator's role.

NAMES NATIONS IN U.S.S.R.

Dobriansky told the Chicago Tribune that the impact of the congressional resolution on Khrushchev apparently lies in the fact that it includes not only the names of recognized satellites of Russia, but also of countries that now are a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The resolution," said Dobriansky, "marks the first time that the United States has recognized by public law that captive nations exist within the U.S.S.R."

A check of the resolution bears Dobriansky out. Mingled in with Poland, Hungary, and other satellite nations are the following Soviet Republics:

White Ruthenia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Ukraine, Turkistan, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. What is Turkistan now once was the Republics of Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, and Kirgizistan.

If Russia had not taken the above countries by force, claimed Dobriansky, it would be a third-rate power now. He said the fact that the resolution contains names of Soviet Republics has received a big play in American foreign language papers read here by the Russian Embassy.

STIRRED BY NAGY FATE

Dobriansky said he got the idea for a congressional resolution recognizing the plight of captive nations at the time of the execution in mid-June of 1958 of Imre Nagy, Premier of Hungary at the time of its unsuccessful revolt against the Kremlin.

He said his first attempt last year consisted of a resolution introduced in the House by Representative ALBERT CRETELLA, Republican, Connecticut, which called for Presidential proclamations on independence or constitution days of 19 captive nations. The resolution died in the House Judiciary Committee on a tie vote. This year he lumped recognition into one Captive Nations Week.

IKK'S WORDING DIFFERENT

Dobriansky pointed out that the congressional resolution refers to Russian communism and Communist Russia as the aggressor in the plight of the captive nations while President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, based on the resolution, refers to Soviet-dominated countries.

He charged the State Department watered down the proclamation because it is unimaginative in failing to realize the power of non-Russian nationalism, hostility, and resistance in the Soviet Union.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 6, 1959]

U.S. PEOPLE AND KHRUSHCHEV—CITIZENS' DISSENT AGAINST VISIT BY DICTATOR HELD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country? President Eisenhower assumes that they do. The governments of Sweden and other Scandinavian countries recently issued a similar invitation, but the Soviet Premier, after accepting it, decided not to go there because it was evident the people didn't want him to come.

What happened in Sweden between the time the invitation was extended and the announcement that Khrushchev had given up the idea for the present? A letter from Dr. Bela Fabian, written from Geneva a few days ago, tells the story. He is chairman

of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners and was in Sweden at the time of the planning for the visit of the Soviet Premier. Dr. Fabian writes:

"Naturally, Major General Zacharov, deputy chief of the Soviet security police, knew that the august committees were preparing mass meetings and demonstrations. In Sweden 10 meetings were to be held simultaneously on August 13. The one thing he did not know was whether the Swedish people would demonstrate by ostentatiously staying at home, so that the streets would be empty and there would be no one there except the police, or that there would be enormous crowds who would turn their backs on Khrushchev."

Dr. Fabian writes that the august committees contained a large number of members, among them prominent intellectuals, several Nobel Prize winners, university professors and writers. Many student organizations were represented.

Already there are varying points of view in this country as to what the reaction of the American people will be in the cities to be visited by Khrushchev. Certainly any disorderly demonstrations would only result in worldwide criticism on the theory that the Americans were not as courteous to the Soviet Premier as the people of the Soviet Union have been toward Vice President Nixon. But inside the United States—unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where everything is controlled by the Government—the people have a right under the Constitution to speak. They have a right to picket peacefully, if they like, with placards expressing their ideas.

If the Scandinavian plan were put into effect in the United States by boycotting the parades or by viewing in silence the public events where Khrushchev makes his appearance, an orderly protest could be registered.

There may be some in this country who are willing to let bygones be bygones, but, among the hundreds of thousands of Americans who came here originally from the lands which now are held captive by the Communist dictatorship, there will be no suppression of emotions. Their point of view toward the Moscow autocracy which has ordered the murder or exile of so many innocent people in the last several years is deeply rooted. They cannot forget.

It is true that, after wars are over, friendly feelings toward former enemies often are developed. But the governments which ruled in Nazi Germany, in militaristic Japan, and Fascist Italy have been removed and free governments established. No such change has occurred in Moscow, where the same kind of regime is in power today as the one that broke the pledges given at Yalta in 1945 and at Geneva in 1955.

"Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all," wrote Dr. L. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in a letter to President Eisenhower dated July 31. The Georgetown professor was the originator of the resolution adopted by Congress to proclaim Captive Nations Week. Expressing the hope that Khrushchev would not be invited to America, Professor Dobriansky added:

"It is patently naive to believe that a visit by the 'hangman of the Ukraine' would add anything to what he already knows about our country. * * * Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires in order to extend his empire."

There is talk now of arranging a parade of hearses in each American city where Khrushchev appears. On each hearse would be placarded the statistics of the number of persons murdered or exiled from each of the 14 captive countries in recent years. This is one type of orderly demonstration.

Another which is being suggested is that memorial services be held throughout the Nation to carry out the spirit of the resolution in behalf of the captive nations adopted overwhelmingly last month by both Houses of Congress. Nationwide prayers for the liberation of the captive peoples, as well as memorial tributes to the many who have been enslaved or killed by the ruthless Communist dictators, would at least let the rest of the world know that, however polite the Government has to be to any visitor, the people here have the right of free speech. They can express their dissent from the position of their Government, which has invited to free America at this crucial time the man who has threatened war unless the Western forces surrender Berlin and who has never withdrawn that threat.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1959]

IRRITATING THE BEAR

Since the idea of a Captive Nations Week originated with me, I should like to reply to the specious and inaccurate arguments you raise against it in your editorial of July 24, "Irritating the Bear."

On the basis of my own lecture experiences, and those of many others, before diverse American groups throughout the country I have no doubt whatsoever that this idea is in complete harmony with the thinking of the vast majority of our people. When the facts of the mortal cold war threat that confronts the security of this Nation are explained to them, they readily perceive the insidious nature of the enemy.

They are not taken in by the wiles of Moscow as, unfortunately, you appear to be. On this observance the Congress and the President are to be commended for reflecting the commonsense and a freedom instinct of the American people.

Contrary to your simplistic comment on sympathy for the captive millions, this national observance goes far beyond emotional sympathetic expressions. Mere sympathy is the last thing the captive peoples need. Basically for our own security as well as their freedom aspirations, what the captive nations need most is the denial of what Khrushchev wants most. And these are respectability and legitimacy based on the security of a consolidated empire.

Your editorial reveals a total lack of comprehension regarding the prior and vital importance of all the captive nations, including those in the Soviet Union, for our own security. It indicates, too, an unawareness of what conditions of "neither peace nor war" mean.

Your suggestion that exile emigre groups sponsored this idea is without any factual foundation. One, the Assembly of Captive Nations, which is really a one-third assembly that speaks in behalf of a minority of captive nations, participated in the observance itself. Surely you would not deny them the right to join with us in this important event.

Further statements in the editorial are as groundless as your alleged points of information. In view of your obvious inability to grasp the concept of total cold war, it is not surprising that you deem the liberation policy "misleading and empty." Being a policy for conditions of "neither peace nor war," its meaning and content would naturally escape you. Furthermore, and factually, it is still the official policy of this administration.

To offer, as you do, Moscow's well-controlled "liberalization" as a substitute basis for our foreign policy efforts is, indeed, the height of intellectual folly. When the Marquis de Custine wrote over a century ago that "foreigners who have described Russia have united with the Russians to deceive the world," he was certainly writing for our

1959

time, too. In less conspicuous but more effective ways terrorism prevails under Nikita the Sanguine as much as it did under Stalin in the late 1920's and early 1930's when another generation of misled Americans was cleverly duped.

All this and more demonstrates how a dearth of knowledge about cold war operations, as developed by Russian autocrats for centuries, can produce a deep and perilous naivete. It is neither "plain" nor a "fact" that, short of a hot war, we are powerless to advance the cause of freedom in Moscow's present empire. The more one examines the evidence on the Hungarian revolution, the more one is convinced that we missed a glorious opportunity. We muffed it because in our ignorance of what cold war operations necessitate, we were not prepared for such an opportunity.

Experience and lessons of history should have taught us by now that appeasement and deals on a basis of equality conduce to the very thing we want to avoid, i.e., a hot global war. You evidently have not profited by these criteria. Khrushchev, a political criminal no matter how you paint him, operates from weakness, not strength.

His outbursts against the congressional resolution can only be explained by the fact that the resolution points to his greatest weakness, namely the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Without these nations, Russia would be a second or third rate power. The spread of such understanding exposes the fiction of equating the United States and the U.S.S.R. as two nations in supposedly peaceful competition.

In Moscow, Mr. Nixon should know better than to perpetuate this fiction. For, in truth, the cold war struggle is between our Nation and Nikita's substrate empire. It is the effect that this will have on his propaganda ruse that disturbs him most. No amount of sputniks, ICBM's, luniks, or grandiose economic plans can conceal this deep weakness in Moscow's position.

When you raise the scare of provocation and a hot war in this matter, you are concealing either your own lack of knowledge or a fear to face basic truths. Neither is of service to our freedom and survival. Don't worry, this action of Congress will not lead to a hot war. In fact, it works against it and also in our decided favor in the cold war. Believe me, we are not trying to irritate the Bear whose appetite you wish to appease. Commonsense urges us properly to cage him so that you will not fall prey to him.

DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

The Future of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, an old acquaintance and friend of mine, Mr. Robert Harriss, is among the businessmen who have a deep concern for the future of agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement that he has prepared for presentation to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTROY AGRICULTURE AND DESTROY AMERICA
(Statement by Robert M. Harriss sent to the U.S. Senate Agriculture Committee and the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee)

Gentlemen, I am a native Texan, but now a resident of Florida. I have been interested in agriculture for the past 40 years and have farms and ranches in Texas, Florida, and old Mexico. I have also had experience in foreign exchange, currencies, and exporting and banking.

Agriculture being our greatest and basic industry upon which the existence of our Nation depends, I believe we agree that this problem should be given first consideration. It is all vital to our national security. I believe if we destroy agriculture we destroy America.

I also believe we will agree that paying our farmers not to produce for the past 25 years has proved uneconomic and destructive. It is against nature's or divine law. While we have been paying our farmers not to produce, Communist Russia and Communist China have been doing everything possible to increase their agricultural production. Our present surpluses are not a liability but could prove one of our greatest assets in combating communism, provided a constructive program is adopted for the disposal of same among the starving, hungry, and needy of the world.

I believe you will agree the American farmer, the man who is feeding and clothing the Nation is entitled to a fair or parity price on that portion of his major non-perishable commodities domestically consumed and leave him a freeman to compete in the world markets at world prices on any surpluses produced above his allotment for domestic consumption. Such a program would be rather simple in administering and would save the Government and taxpayers billions of dollars. If the farmer produced in excess of his domestic allotment he would have the option of either selling it in the world market at world prices or holding his surplus against his allotment for the following year. If the domestic consumption should prove less than anticipated then the excess production could be held by the Government for a reduction in the allotment for the following year. If the domestic consumption should prove more than the allotment, then the farmer or the Government could be permitted to sell the shortage out of their surplus.

Regarding the existing surpluses in major nonperishable commodities, the selling of them should not be left to the discretion of any one man. A portion of them should be stockpiled for national emergency and the selling of the remainder should be definitely fixed equally over a 5- or 10-year period but only for disposal in the world markets.

To facilitate the disposal of existing surpluses three things should be done without delay:

1. Government credit insurance to American exporters on liberal terms guaranteed by reputable foreign buyers.
2. Long-term loans with acceptance of foreign currency of friendly free nations as collateral.
3. Outright gifts to the people of certain nations who are in dire need of food and clothing and under the control of our Government.

Regarding the perishable crops: It would be impracticable to have a domestic allotment on these. However, I think you will agree that our farmers are entitled to the domestic market on these crops and should be fairly protected against the importation of perishable crops from foreign countries that they can produce with their cheap labor and low taxes at much less than our American farmers with high labor and

standard of living and taxes. Many of our American manufacturers are now beginning to find that they cannot compete with foreign nations for this same reason. In a recent article Mr. Leslie Gould, one of the outstanding financial authorities in the country, stated, "Today, foreign steel producers can and are underselling American companies in the domestic market and in neighboring Canada. The same for many other goods."

There may be opposition from certain foreign sources regarding adoption of the domestic allotment plan and the orderly disposal of existing surplus commodities. However, why should we permit foreign sources to dictate our economic and agricultural program. Why should the domestic market not be protected for our own farmers at fair or parity prices and why should they not be left free men to compete in the world market at world prices on any surpluses.

In connection with the foregoing it would be well for us to take into consideration the following farm and agricultural statistics:

According to Government figures the national income has increased 100 percent during the past 12 years and at the same time agricultural income has declined 20 percent, and to make the situation worse the purchasing power of the paper dollar they receive has declined 33 percent. In other words, in terms of dollar purchasing power agriculture is receiving only about half of what they received 12 years ago. The farmers' situation is even worse. According to Government figures, the net farm income, compared to national income, was 104 percent more 12 years ago and, considering the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, he is only receiving a net income of about one-third what he received 12 years ago. Is it any wonder that during these 12 years the farm population has declined more than 6,500,000 despite the increase in the national population from 144 million to 174 million? Has not the influx of farm population to the cities and factories had a direct influence on unemployment and relief?

I do not believe the domestic allotment program would be the fundamental solution of our economic troubles, but it would be helpful and constructive for agriculture and our economy and save the Government and the taxpayers billions of dollars.

I believe the most helpful step that could be taken for a sound national recovery would be a free gold market. Since the value of gold was arbitrarily fixed 25 years ago, the general price level and labor costs have risen about 300 percent, while the only recognized medium of exchange—gold, has been arbitrarily pegged at \$35 per ounce. How can we have a sound recovery in our country or world recovery until we have a free medium of exchange on which exports and imports and world trade is based—gold. This would naturally result in a higher price for gold in terms of the unredeemable paper dollar, which would be essentially helpful not only to agriculture, industry, business, and labor, but a sound national and world recovery. This because such a free gold market would permit foreign nations to buy more of our agricultural and manufactured products for less gold. During the past 24 months we have been losing gold at an alarming rate; about \$3 billion of gold has been lost during this period. In Associated Press, June 24, 1959, article by Mr. Sam Dawson, he stated "Uncle Sam's stock of gold is dropping below \$20 billion for the first time since 1940, when it was nearly \$25 billion. At the same time total payments by the United States to other nations continue to exceed receipts from them. Latest figures show exports slipping while imports hold high." New York Times article on financial page, June 25, 1959, also

September 14

stated U.S. gold stock was below \$20 billion for the first time since 1940. About one-half the gold in the United States is earmarked or belongs to foreigners or foreign governments. Why wait for the inevitable to happen and, in the meantime permit confusion and inflation and economic conditions to grow worse? Until we establish a free gold market and find out what the paper dollar is worth in terms of gold, economists whose opinion I value and agree with, believe the inflation and debasement of the paper dollar will continue.

Some argue that because England, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Russia, and other countries urge higher price gold we should not cooperate in same. They also argue it would be helpful to Communist Russia. May it not be the case that because Communist Russia advocated higher price gold they do not want it because they know their advocacy would be a handicap in bringing it about? Also higher price gold is not important to Communist Russia as the free world, because Communist Russia produces gold with slave labor. The record shows the present price of gold is destroying the gold mining industry in the United States and adversely affecting allied mining. Eighteen years ago we produced 270 percent more gold than now. In any event we own a large part of the gold. Therefore, higher price gold would be helpful to our exports of agriculture, manufactured goods and our economy; also a free gold market is essential to free trade. In the long run this would be most detrimental to Communist Russia.

Not long ago Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Economic Minister of West Germany, who is credited with engineering Germany's prosperity to its present world position, when asked if he saw any end to the gradual decline in the purchasing power of money, replied: "There is no way of knowing whether the dangerous trend toward inflation will come to an end, so long as there is no real progress toward making currencies freely convertible into gold." Recently I attended an all-day seminar on the gold, dollar, and inflation question given by Dr. Franz Pick, who is considered one of the outstanding world authorities on gold and the money question. Dr. Pick was of the opinion that inflation, debasement of the dollar and confusion would continue and grow worse until we had higher price gold. With your permission I would like to leave a few articles that have a direct bearing on Dr. Erhard's and Dr. Pick's statements, if you desire them for the record.

As some of us may remember, in March 1933, when our country was in the depths of the worst depression in history, we were forced to place an embargo against the exportation of our gold. This was promptly followed by unbelievable economic recovery in agriculture, industry, business, and employment.

Economists, whose opinions I value, do not advocate the arbitrary raising and pegging the price of gold at a fixed price. We advocate a constructive monetary policy on gold, medium of exchange for 6,000 years; first, an embargo on the exportation of our gold followed by a free gold market, to determine what the value of the unredeemable paper dollar is worth in terms of gold. When this has been determined we can return to redeemable currency and with economy in Government and a balanced budget. We can go forward with a sound prosperity for agriculture, industry, and world trade and recovery.

Attached are some statistics, reports, and data, substantiating the foregoing, which I believe conclusively prove:

1. That inflation will continue as long as we are on a paper unredeemable dollar and end in disaster.

2. That in order to return to redeemable currency we must have higher priced gold.

3. We should stop the export of gold until it can be determined what the dollar is actually worth in terms of gold.

4. That higher priced gold would be of great benefit to agriculture, industry, and labor because it would make it possible for foreign countries to buy more of our surplus commodities and goods and make it more difficult to dump cheap foreign products on the American market.

5. On pages 9 and 10 of the gold report it shows the falsity of the Communist propaganda that higher priced gold would help Communist Russia and that the reverse is true—that higher priced gold would be of great benefit to the economy of our country, the free nations, and damaging to Communist Russia and other Communist countries.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. HARRISS

1. U.S. figures, agricultural income, July 1958.

2. U.S. figures, farm income and population, July 1958.

3. U.S. figures, gross and net farm operator's income, July 1958.

4. Dr. Franz Pick figures, March 1959.

5. New York Times article, June 26, 1959.

6. New York World-Telegram Sun article, June 24, 1959.

7. The Gold Report, June 1, 1959.

8. Shields & Co. market report, June 2, 1959.

9. International gold market, Toronto, Canada.

10. Sears article in Commercial and Financial Chronicle, May 14, 1959.

11. Dr. Pick's article in the Northern Miner, April 23, 1959.

12. Gould article New York Journal American, June 15, 1959.

13. Dr. Rumely's telegram to President Eisenhower, March 10, 1958.

14. Extract from Robert M. Harriss' statement before the House Ways and Means Committee, May 3, 1932.

15. Extracts from Robert M. Harriss' radio address, station WOR, New York, February 17, 1935.

16. Gold report by Loyd L. Parker, August 21, 1959.

17. Gold reserve in Sunday New York Times, September 6, 1959.

Appropriations for Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a letter that I have received from our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] conveying to me information what his subcommittee did in relation to appropriations for medical research. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is entitled to the thanks of the American people for his great leadership in this great field of such vast importance to the American people and, in fact, to human beings throughout the world. As the result of appropriations made by the Congress, under the leadership of JOHN FOGARTY, great advances have been made in medical research, all beneficial to sick and suffering human beings.

This action alone is one of the great contributions of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. The information of the action of this Congress, in this important field, should be disseminated as broadly as possible.

AUGUST 19, 1959.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This is in reply to your recent note regarding appropriations that this session of Congress has made for certain public health programs.

Medical research undoubtedly attracts the attention and interest of the people to a greater extent than any other program in this field. The Federal Government's activity in medical research is largely centered in the National Institutes of Health. The following table will summarize, statistically, the appropriation made for N.I.H. this year compared with the President's budget and last year's appropriation.

	Appropriation for fiscal year 1959	President's budget for fiscal year 1960	Appropriation for fiscal year 1960	Appropriation for 1960 compared with—	
				Appropriation for 1959	President's budget for 1960
General research	\$28,974,000	\$28,974,000	\$45,994,000	+\$17,020,000	+\$17,020,000
Cancer	75,268,000	75,218,000	91,257,000	+15,989,000	+16,039,000
Mental health	52,419,000	52,384,000	68,090,000	+15,671,000	+15,706,000
Heart	45,613,000	45,594,000	62,237,000	+16,624,000	+16,643,000
Dental health	7,420,000	7,420,000	10,019,000	+2,599,000	+2,599,000
Arthritis and metabolic diseases	31,215,000	31,215,000	46,862,000	+15,647,000	+15,647,000
Allergy and infectious diseases	24,071,000	24,071,000	34,054,000	+9,983,000	+9,983,000
Neurology and blindness	29,403,000	29,403,000	41,487,000	+12,084,000	+12,084,000
Total	294,383,000	294,279,000	400,000,000	+105,617,000	+105,721,000

The budget for 1960 appeared on the surface to represent a leveling off of our medical research program but actually it would have been a definite and significant backward step. In the hearings, we developed the fact that increased costs in

1960 would amount to over \$15 million which, under the budget, could have been met only by cutting back the level of medical research. It was further developed that the budget actually lacked more than \$2 million of being adequate just to finance the